

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed September 30, 2008 and is filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and the fee for a three-month extension of time.

Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 9 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Andrews. Claims 8 and 11 were rejected the Taylor/Andrews combination and further in view of Hibbets et al. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is hereby respectfully requested, for the reasons indicated below.

As the Examiner will note, the claims have been amended to recite that the data format includes “at least a first name, a last name, an email address and a selection of the data source”. The Taylor reference does not teach or suggest that the “attributes” include at least a first name, a last name, an email address and a selection of the data source. To the contrary, the wells of biological samples of Taylor’s microplates are, understandably, not associated with any such attributes. Also, Andrews does not teach or to suggest that the user-definable data format includes a selection a database or a spreadsheet file as the data source on which the selected rules are to be applied.

Note that the claims variously recite that the user-defined rules are executed on the mapped data to score the mapped data and to produce a set of analyzed data that is usable to assess the quality of sales leads in the data source. Also, the claims require that, depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, the analyzed data is sorted into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules. Support

for the language added to the claims may be found in the originally-filed specification, beginning at paragraph [0033]. The Hibbets reference was relied on for its teaching of a sort window that enables the user to sort data. As disclosed in Hibbets, at Col. 5, lines 1-13, the

5
10

sort window 344 allows the user to sort data before viewing it on the display 104. The sort window 344 contains a sort window database field listbox 322, which lists all of the database fields in the user-selected database tables. Using the mouse device 110, the user can double click on any of these fields or single click on the field and select the sort window add button 346 to move them to the "fields to sort" 354. Likewise, the user can remove fields from the "fields to sort" listbox 354 by double clicking on the selections, or by single clicking on the selections and selecting the sort window remove button 348. All fields in the "fields to sort" listbox 354 can be cleared by selecting the sort window clear all button 350.

Therefore, the sorting that is carried out by the user to filter that data to be displayed on the display 104. In Hibbets, the user is shown a list of all of the database fields in the user-selected database tables and may select one or more of those fields, whereupon the system sorts through the selected database tables to display those data that fit the user-selected database fields on the display 104.

In direct contrast, the claimed embodiments call for...

executing the plurality of rules on the mapped data to score the mapped data and produce a set of analyzed data usable to assess the quality of sales leads in the data source, and

depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, sorting the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.

That is, the rules are executed on the mapped data to a) score the mapped data and b) to produce a set of analyzed data that is usable to assess the quality of sales leads in the data source.

Moreover, and in contradistinction with Hibbets and the applied combination as a whole, the rules are executed on the mapped data to c) generate analyzed data that is sorted, based upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, into a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data did not pass all of the executed plurality of rules. In Hibbets, therefore, the user selects which data to display based upon selected database fields, whereupon the claimed embodiments require the execution of user-defined rules that assess the quality of the data and that sort the analyzed data into buckets depending upon the outcome of each of the plurality of rules. Such is neither taught nor suggested by Hibbets or the applied combination as a whole.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of the claims is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Applicants believe this application is now in condition for allowance. If any unresolved issues remain, please contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number indicated below and whatever is necessary to resolve such issues will be done at once.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 30, 2009

By: _____

Alan W. Young
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,970

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 Alpine Rd., Ste. 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel.: (650) 851-7210
Fax: (650) 851-7232

